

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Fig. 2 has been amended to change the word “Internet” in oval 24 to “Intranet.” This amendment is to make Fig. 2 consistent with the description on page 6, last paragraph. No new matter has been added.

Attachments: Replacement Sheet (Fig. 2)

REMARKS

Claims 4, 5, and 14 are pending.

Claims 1-3, 6-13, and 15-19 have been cancelled, without prejudice.

Claims 20-31 have been added.

In the Office Action mailed April 27, 2010, claims 1-10, 18, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101; claims 1-3, 5-13, and 15-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Kavanaugh (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0081607); and claims 4, 14, 18, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kavanaugh in view of Mohaban (U.S. Patent No. 7,346,677).

Independent claims 1 and 11 have been cancelled, and replaced with new independent claims 20 and 26. The § 101 issue raised in the Office Action has been addressed in new independent claim 20. The § 101 rejection of former claims 18 and 19 has been rendered moot by the cancellation of those claims. Withdrawal of the § 101 rejections is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 20 recites a mobile station having a wireless interface and processing hardware configured to activate plural communication contexts for communication of data in respective communication sessions, and in response to activation of each of the plural communication contexts, create a corresponding security task that furnishes a respective firewall function. The firewall function of each of the security tasks is associated with a respective set of filtration parameters, where the set of filtration parameters for a first of the security tasks differs from the set of filtration parameters for a second of the security tasks.

Kavanaugh does not provide any teaching or hint of a **mobile station** having processing hardware configured to create corresponding security tasks as recited in claim 20. The GTP filter of Kavanaugh inspects “all GTP packets and performs specific filtering rules” Kavanaugh, ¶ [0034]. As noted in Kavanaugh, “it would be advantageous to have a method of filtering IP packets when utilizing GTP signaling messages between GSNs in a GPRS network.” *Id.*, ¶ [0012]. A “GSN” refers to a GPRS support node, as explained in ¶¶ [0005]-[0009] of Kavanaugh. As further noted in Kavanaugh, a GTP tunnel is established for each PDP context, where the GDP tunnel includes a GTP control plane over a Gn or Gp interface, and a GTP user plane over Gn,

Gp, and Iu interfaces. *Id.*, ¶ [0009]. As depicted in Fig. 1 of Kavanaugh, the Gn interfaces are between SGSNs, between an SGSN and a GGSN, or between the GGSN and a GTP map protocol converting GSN. Thus, it is clear that the GTP filter, which is used to examine GTP messages, is implemented in a GSN, and **not** in a mobile station.

In view of the foregoing, it is clear that claim 20 is allowable over Kavanaugh.

Independent claim 26 is similarly allowable over Kavanaugh.

The secondary reference, Mohaban, cited by the Office Action does not remedy the shortcoming of Kavanaugh with respect to the claimed subject matter. Therefore, all claims are also allowable over Mohaban.

Dependent claims, including newly added dependent claims 21-25 and 27-31, are allowable for at least the same reasons as corresponding independent claims.

In view of the foregoing, allowance of all claims is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees and/or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 14-1315 (16359FRUS03N).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 27, 2010

/Dan C. Hu/

Dan C. Hu
Registration No. 40,025
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750
Houston, TX 77057-2631
Telephone: (713) 468-8880
Facsimile: (713) 468-8883